

9N



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,100	09/26/2001	Ikuo Ozawa	4041K-000036	3018

27572 7590 11/20/2002

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER

CIRIC, LJILJANA V


ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3743

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

62

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/964,100	Applicant(s) Ozawa et al.	
	Examiner Ljiljana V. Ciric	Art Unit 3743	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Ljiljana V. Ciric (3) _____
 (2) Michael J. Schmidt, Reg. No. 34,007 (4) _____

Date of Interview Nov 19, 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal (copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1-7

Identification of prior art discussed:

Holka (US. Patent No. 5,588,482); Tepas et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,671,803); Bolton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,219,016)--all previously of record

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Attorney Schmidt telephoned Examiner Ciric in order to discuss the prior art rejections cited in the previous Office action. In particular, Attorney Schmidt noted that the Tepas et al. and the Bolton et al. references do not show the respective fan units to be arranged upstream of the radiator and the heat exchanger with respect to the airflow as cited in claims 1 and 4. He also stated that an afterfinal response has been recently filed containing the same arguments. Examiner Ciric noted that, upon receipt of the afterfinal response, she will reconsider the previously cited prior art rejections in view of the arguments presented, and if necessary, either withdraw one or more of these rejections or remove finality of the application, or both, if needed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

**LJILJANA V. CIRIC
 PRIMARY EXAMINER
 ART UNIT 3743**

Ljiljana V. Ciric

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required